

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending, including independent claims 1 and 10. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 USC 102 in light of Bradley. Claims 4-5 were rejected under 35 USC 103 in light of Bradley in view of Smith. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 103 in light of Bradley in view of Northrop. Claims 10-19 were rejected under 35 USC 102 in light Northrop. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103 in light Northrop in view of Bradley.

It is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1 and 10 each contain elements not taught or suggested in the cited references either singularly or in combination.

In particular, it is noted that claim 1 includes a “lock feature preventing disengagement after connection with the other lawn edging strip” and claim 10 includes “providing a locking mechanism on the flexible body that hinders the disengagement of two engaged flexible bodies.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose such a locking mechanism. Instead, each of the cited references provides a slot like engagement system in which an extension member may slide into a slot. However, neither the slot nor the extension member are fashioned in a manner such that the reverse movement is hindered such that greater energy is needed to move the extension member in the reverse direction out of the slot. Thus, the claimed locking feature of the present claims is absent.

For example, as shown in Bradley Figure 1, a slot 104 may receive a corresponding extension member 102 in a downward vertical movement manner. However, the extension member 102 is not locked into the slot 104 as the extension member may be moved upward just as easily as downward. Thus, the extension member is free to slide into (downward) and out (upward) of the slot member.

Likewise, as shown in Smith Figure 4, a slot 32 may receive a corresponding extension member 30 in a forward or backward (out of the page) movement manner. However, the extension member 30 is not locked into the slot 32 as the extension member may be moved

forward just as easily as backward. Thus, the extension member is free to slide into (forward) and out (backward) of the slot member. To attempt to compensate for this, in Figure 1 Smith discloses an additional coupler feature 40 that slides over the ends of the landscape structure to secure the ends together (“By this structure, a positioning of one of the couplers 40 over adjacent vertical plates 18, 22, or 24 will operate to maintain the vertical plate securing projection 30 within the respective vertical plate securing aperture 32” Col. 4, lines 49-52).

Similarly, as shown in Northrup Figures 1 and 2, a slot 52 may receive a corresponding extension member 58 in a downward vertical movement manner. However, the extension member 58 is not locked into the slot 52 as the extension member may be moved upward just as easily as downward. Thus the extension member is free to slide into (downward) and out (upward) of the slot member.

It is respectfully noted in claim 1 the claimed “pocket connector” includes both the lock feature and the slot feature. Moreover the claim further states the “lock feature preventing disengagement after connection with the other lawn edging strip.” Similarly, in claim 10 the flexible body includes a locking mechanism and the claim further includes “providing a locking mechanism on the flexible body that hinders the disengagement of two engaged flexible bodies.” As noted above, each of the cited references do not provide a locking mechanism and none of the references hinder the disengagement in a locking fashion as the prior art slots and extensions are configured in a manner such that the extensions may be freely moved into and out of the slots.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that even if combined the cited references do not contain elements of independent claims 1 and 10 (and those claims depending therefrom).


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and Notice of Allowance are courteously solicited.

A request for a two-month extension of time is enclosed herewith along with the appropriate fee. No additional extension of time is believed to be needed in connection with the filing of this paper. However, if an additional extension is deemed to be needed, please consider this paper to be a request for such additional extension and deduct any required fee from deposit account 10-1205/EASY:021.

Should any additional fees under 37 CFR 1.16-1.21 be required for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account No. 10-1205/EASY:021. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Richard D. Egan  
Registration No. 36,788  
Attorney for Applicant

O'KEEFE, EGAN & PETERMAN, LLP  
1101 Capital of Texas Highway South  
Building C, Suite 200  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 347-1611  
FAX: (512) 347-1615